DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 821 HE 011 186

AUTHOR Blackmon, C. Robert; Stearns, Mary Louise
TITLE Doctoral Graduates in Education From Louisiana State University, 1975-1978: A Follow-up Study. Volume 9, Number 1.
INSTITUTION Louisiana State Univ., Baton Rouge. Bureau of Educational Materials and Research.
PUB DATE Mar 79
NOTE 25p.
AVAILABLE FROM Bureau of Educational Materials and Research, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803 ($2.50)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Doctoral Degrees; *Employer Attitudes; Employer Employee Relationship; *Employment Experience; Followup Studies; *Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; Learning Experience; Professional Personnel; Student Opinion; Vocational Adjustment; *Vocational Followup
IDENTIFIERS *Louisiana State University

ABSTRACT

A followup study was conducted of the 62 Louisiana State University doctoral graduates of the College of Education from May 1975 through May 1978. A questionnaire was administered to gather data related to the graduate's experiences in and reactions to the doctoral program and on the relationship of that program to subsequent employment. An opinionnaire was administered to evaluate each graduate by the graduate's immediate supervisor. Data are presented on the results of the 39-item questionnaire based on 56 responses and on the results of the 23-item opinionnaire based on 45 responses. The graduates' questionnaire included the areas of related studies, present job status, an evaluation by each respondent of the doctoral preparation program experienced in the College of Education, and professional and civic activities. The items of the two surveys are presented with the response data, and conclusions of the study are provided. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169821

DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATION FROM LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, 1975-78: A FOLLOW-UP STUDY

Vol. 9, No. 1 March, 1979

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Robert Blackmon
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

by

C. Robert Blackmon, Ed. D.
Professor of Education
Louisiana State University

and

Mrs. Mary Louise Stearns
Graduate Assistant

Published by

Bureau of Educational Materials and Research
131 Peabody Hall, College of Education
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

C. Robert Blackmon, Director

Peter A. Soderbergh, Dean
College of Education

Louisiana State University assures equal opportunity for all qualified persons without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, handicap, marital status, or veteran's status in the admission to, participation in, or employment in the programs and activities which the university operates.

This public document was published under authority of special exception by the Division of Administration of the State of Louisiana in accordance with Act 130 of 1978, pursuant to the Division of Administration Policy and Procedure Memorandum No. 64 of September 8, 1978, by the Louisiana State University Bureau of Educational Materials and Research at an estimated production cost of $0.50 per copy(exclusive of professional time and indirect costs). Individual copies may not be purchased. Distribution will be limited.

HE 011 182

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
BASIC RELATED DATA	3
PART I--GRADUATES' QUESTIONNAIRE	
A. Related Studies	4
B. Present Job Status	6
C. Graduates' Perceptions of Doctoral Program	8
D. Professional and Civic Activities	11
PART II--EMPLOYRES' OPINIONNAIRE	13
CONCLUSIONS	18
APPENDIX 1	21
APPENDIX 2	22

INTRODUCTION

This follow-up study of the 62 Louisiana State University doctoral graduates of the College of Education from May, 1975, through May, 1978, was performed in two parts by the Bureau of Educational Research of the Louisiana State University College of Education. Part I (Questionnaire) was designed to gather data related to each graduate's experiences in and reactions to the doctoral program and on the relationship of that program to his/her subsequent employment. Part II (Opinionnaire) requested an evaluation of each graduate by his/her immediate superior.

A 39-item questionnaire was mailed to 61 of the 62 graduates. One graduate could not be located, and five of the 61 did not reply. Therefore, the data reported in Part I in this study were taken from the 56 (91.8%) returns received.

Upon receipt of permission from the graduates to do so, a 23-item Opinionnaire was mailed to 45 supervisory superiors of the graduates. No Opinionnaire was mailed for the 4 graduates who were self-employed, and no survey was sent to the superiors of the 7 graduates who did not grant permission to do so.

The graduates' Questionnaire included the areas of related studies, present job status, an evaluation by each respondent of the doctoral preparation program experienced in the LSU College of Education, and professional and civic activities. Part I of this report summarizes the data collected in each of the four major areas included in the graduates' Questionnaire. (See Appendix 1 also.)

The summary of the data for Part II of this study follows the format of the Opinionnaire sent to the graduates' supervisors for evaluation of the graduates. Numbers and percentages vary because on some of the Opinion-

naires not all parts were completed.

Just prior to this study, a committee of the Graduate Education Faculty concluded a study of the doctoral program in Education and made important recommendations for change--subsequently accepted by the Graduate Education Faculty on November 6, 1975--regarding differentiated course requirements and minimum semester hours required for the Ph.D. and Ed.D. degrees. However, as of August, 1978, no one had completed a program prescribed under the revised requirements.

The writers' conclusions were based upon the data collected from both the graduates and their immediate superiors.

BASIC RELATED DATA

Basic data about the graduate and his/her previous educational preparation were obtained from University records. A summary of those data is given below.

Ed. D.'s awarded (43.6% of 62 doctorates)	27
Ph. D.'s awarded (56.5% of 62 doctorates)	35
Mean of ages at receipt of degree (N=62)	39.5 years
Mean of Miller Analogy Test scores (N=57)	51.4
Mean of Graduate Record Examination scores	
Verbal (N=62)	556
Quantitative (N=62)	458
Total (V+Q) (N=62)	952
Advanced (N=60)	513
Grade point averages (4.0 base)	
Undergraduate (N=58)	2.95
Graduate (N=61)	3.77

Dissertations

Type	Ed.D.	Ph.D.	Totals
Historical	4	3	7
Descriptive	16	20	36
Experimental	7	12	19
Totals	27	35	62

Part I

A. Related Studies

Each graduate was requested to respond to questions which sought information about related studies prior to or during the doctoral program.

1. Did you write a thesis for your master's degree?
   Yes: 7 (12.5%) (N=56)

2. Did you write a research paper or thesis for the Specialist Certificate?
   Yes: 1 (33%) (N=3)

3. Which foreign language was passed as a part of the Ph.D. program?

French	17	German	5	8	Passed previously--language not stated.
Spanish	4	English	1		

4. Have you taken one or more courses in computer science (data processing)?
   47 None 6 One 3 Two or more
   Were those courses taken during your doctoral program at LSU? 2 Yes 11 No

5. Were your courses in educational statistics taken during your doctoral program at LSU? 48 Yes 8 No

6. Prior degrees earned, institutions, and year earned:

Bachelor's Degrees

Arellano College (2)	1965(2)
Arkansas Tech University	1962
Belmont College	1964
Centenary College	1957
College of Lit., Tehran	1970
Dominican College	1951
East Carolina University	1941
Florida State University	1953
Grambling University	1954
Jackson State College	1950
Kansas State University	1961
Kenyon College	1966
Lamar State University	1963
Louisiana State University (13)	1950, 1952, 1956(2), 1957, 1958, 1959, 1961, 1963, 1965, 1967, 1969, 1970
Louisiana Tech University (5)	1956, 1964, 1970(2), 1971
McNeese State University	1969
Mississippi State University (3)	1958, 1967, 1970
New Mexico State University	1970
Nicholls State University (3)	1962, 1965, 1972
Northwestern Louisiana University (2)	1956, 1959

Northwestern University (IL)	1968
Ohio State University	1961
Randolph-Macon Woman's College	1958
Rice University	1944
Southeastern Louisiana University (3)	1941, 1951, 1966
Southern University (3)	1959, 1960, 1963
Tulane University	1950
University of Southern Mississippi (2)	1958, 1972
University Southwestern Louisiana (4)	1960, 1962(2), 1964

Master's Degrees

Catholic University	1970
Florida State University	1960
Ft. Valley State College	1974
Indiana University (2)	1966, 1969
Kenyon College	1973
Louisiana State University (28)	1954, 1957, 1959(2), 1961(2), 1963(2), 1965, 1966, 1967(3), 1969, 1971(6), 1972(4), 1973, 1974, 1975(2).
Louisiana Tech University (2)	1972, 1973
Loyola University of the South	1959
McNeese State University (2)	1967, 1968
Middle Tennessee State University	1967
Mississippi College	1973
Mississippi State University (3)	1959, 1965, 1970
Northwestern State University (LA) (2)	1958(2)
Northwestern University (IL)	1954
Nicholls State University	1973
Ohio University	1975
George Peabody College for Teachers	1958
Purdue University	1973
Southern University (3)	1967(2), 1968
Tulane University (2)	1960(2)
University of Arkansas (2)	1965, 1976
University of Florida	1967
University of Missouri	1970
University of Southern Mississippi	1973
University Southwestern Louisiana (2)	1961, 1965
Westminster College	1964

Education Specialist

Nicholls State University	1971
Louisiana State University (2)	1975(2)
University Southwestern Louisiana (2)	1971(2)

B. Present Job Status

1. We would like your permission to send a confidential Questionnaire to your supervisory superior. (N=56)

Permission for sending Questionnaire		Percentage
Yes	45	80.35
No	4	7.17
Self-employed	3	5.35
NR	4	7.17

2. State the institution or firm where you are now employed.

Graduates	Institution	Percentage
24	College or university	42.9
20	Public schools (10 teachers, 6 board or staff personnel, 3 principals, and 1 at a Lab School)	35.7
2	State Department of Education	3.6
1	Private school	1.8
1	Professional organization	1.8
8	Other than education	14.3
N=56		

3. How many years have you been employed in your present position?

Length of Employment	N	Percentage
Less than 1 year	6	11.1
1-5 years	24	44.4
6-10 years	10	18.5
11-15 years	9	16.7
16-20 years	2	3.7
21-25 years	2	3.7
26-30 years	1	1.9

The average length of employment of 54 of the 56 respondents in their present positions was approximately 6.8 years. One was not employed, and one did not respond to this item.

Mean: 6.9 years Median: 2.6 years

4. Please identify your term of employment per year.

55 Fulltime (at least nine months) 1 Not employed

5. Which identifies the major responsibility in your present position?

N	Responsibility	Percentage*
18	Administration and Supervision	32
31	Teaching	55
7	Research	12.5
5	Other	8.9

*Some respondents marked more than one area.

6. What is your present title or academic rank?

N	Title or Rank	Percentage*
1	Professor	1.8
8	Associate Professor	14.3
10	Assistant Professor	17.9
6	Instructor	10.7
4	Principals	7.1
9	Classroom teachers	16.0
23	Other (Administrative Asst., LSDE; Assoc Dir., Instrn'l Resources Center; Asst. Specialist, Coop. Extension; Coordinator; Coordinator of Freshman Studies; Consultant; Dir., Bureau of Higher Ed. and Teacher Certification; Libn; Not employed; Pastoral Counselor; Reading Coordinator (College); Research Specialist; Sales; Self-employed; Supervisor.	41%

*Some respondents marked more than one rank or position.

7. Approximately what is your total annual salary from your current position (to the nearest thousand dollars)?

N	Salary Range	Percentage
1	less than 10,000	1.8
5	10,000 - 14,999	8.9
27	15,000 - 19,999	48.2
10	20,000 - 24,999	17.9
6	25,000 - 29,999	10.7
3	30,000 or more	5.4
4	No response	7.1
56		

Mean: $18,125 Median: $15,214

8. Which of these was most decisive for you in obtaining your present position: (N=56)

N	Method	Percentage
14	Through application without knowledge of opening	25.0
8	Advertisement in circular	14.3
6	Through a friend	10.7
6	Recommended by LSU professor	10.7
2	Through application	3.6
2	Recommended by professor elsewhere	3.6
1	Placement Agency	1.8
18	Other	32.1
57	(One listed two methods.)	

9. In how many positions have you been employed, since earning your doctorate?

Number of Positions		Percentage
1	37	66
2	16	28.6
3	1	1.8
NR	2	3.6

C. Graduates' Perceptions of Doctoral Program

Each graduate was requested to give information about decisions--and the reasons for those decisions--relevant to the doctoral program and to offer perceptions of that program. The responses are reported below.

1. Why did you choose to pursue the doctorate at LSU's College of Education?

Location	28	Promotion	2
Reputation and standing	15	Family	1
Faculty	9	Age	1
Fitted needs and goals	7	Interest in Research	1
Cost	4		

2. Prior to doctoral study at LSU how long did you live in Louisiana?

N	Years	Percentage
24	All of my life	42.8
17	Most of my life	30.3
8	Only a few years	14.3
1	Periodically	1.8
6	None	10.7

3. Major sources of financial support during your years of full-time doctoral residency. (Some reported more than one source.)

Personal friends	22	Other	5
Sabbatical pay	22	Veteran's benefits	4
Assistantship	9	Fellowship	2
Part-time employment	7	Loan	2

4. Did you have a position as graduate assistant (paid, with duties) during your year of full-time doctoral residency? Yes: 30

25	No
18	Non-teaching
15	Teaching
	(Three had both types of duties.)
1	N R

5. Identify the most important positive factor that influenced your choice of Ph.D. or Ed.D.

15	Professional emphasis of Ed.D.
14	Prestige of Ph.D.
13	Professional goals
9	Major professor
7	Ph.D. language requirement
6	Research emphasis of Ph.D.
2	Ph.D. statistics
1	Type of dissertation

6. Identify who or what most influenced your dissertation topic.

31	Area of personal interest
12	Major professor
6	Problem of personal concern
4	Other
2	Problem within home system

(Some gave more than one response.)

7. Were there any professional relationships or experiences that you did not have in the doctoral program which you now wish you had had?
(For reporting, the somewhat diverse responses were grouped into major ideas or areas below.)

None--It was a most rewarding experience.

More instruction in and practice with research tools such as statistics, computer science, research design, and writing.

More interaction with faculty and doctoral candidates, including seminars, practicums or internships, graduate assistantships, social, travel, required publication.

Courses related to teaching content, multi-cultural education, scholarly reading experiences.

Fulltime on campus without employment.

Strong leadership of chairman of committee.

8. In terms of your doctoral program what was the area of study, course or experience most useful to you in the position(s) you have held since earning the doctorate?

Seminar in education literature	16
Research	11
Statistics	7
Tests and measurements	6
Administration	6
Dissertation	4
Writing	3
Philosophy	3
Supervision	2

9. In terms of your doctoral program, what was the area of study, course or experience least useful to you in the position(s) you have held since earning the doctorate?
(For reporting, the somewhat diverse responses were grouped into the major ideas or areas below.)

History and Philosophy of Education	10
All were useful	4
Media courses	4
Foreign language	2
Sociology	2
Psychology minor	2

10. How would you rate your interpersonal relationship with the following faculty members?

5-Superior 3-Good 1-Poor
4-Excellent 2-Fair 0-NR

a. Advisor prior to getting a doctoral committee?

Superior	36	Good	4	Poor	1
Excellent	13	Fair	1	NR	1

Average 4.5

b. Doctoral committee chairman (if not the same as advisor)?

Superior	8	Good	2	Poor	0
Excellent	2	Fair	0	NR	1

Average 4.5

c. Other doctoral committee members from the College of Education?

Superior	20	Good	12	Poor	1
Excellent	19	Fair	3	NR	1

Average 4.0

d. Doctoral committee member(s) from outside the College of Education?

Superior	19	Good	13	Poor	2
Excellent	16	Fair	5	NR	1

Average 3.8

11. Knowing what you now know about your doctoral program, if at the present time you had not received the Ph.D. or Ed.D., would you now enter the doctoral program at LSU? (R=53)

Yes	42	79.2%	No	10	18.9%	Uncertain	1 1.9%

12. Comments, suggestions or criticisms you would like to mention.

Did a good job for me; have only praise for LSU; proud of LSU degree. rewarding professional experience.
Professors were thorough, expert in field, professional, helpful, had greatest feelings for their students.
Capable instructors: some outstanding but all good teachers.
Professors should have more diverse backgrounds and wider experiences, be up-to-date, and there should be more faculty per subject.
No real difference in Ed.D. and Ph.D.; need to restructure the programs, technically and philosophically.*
Need higher standards for program; rate of acceptance high.
Continue emphasizing extensive professional reading, independent study, and documentation when writing exams.
Little encouragement by faculty; interpersonal relationships do not motivate students; more "community feeling" among students and faculty as a separate group.

12. (Cont'd)
Education courses not challenging. Every experience should academically enrich students.
Restructure college into specialized programs in subject matter areas (i.e., science education and math education).
Need closer cooperation between Psychology and Education, perhaps to share a degree.
Counseling program needs courses in non-educational situations.**
Need more support and guidance from major professor and committee.
Disappointed in loss of NCATE accreditation; feel it imperative to regain it.

*As of November 6, 1975, the Graduate Faculty in Education ratified separate programs differentiated in philosophy, experiences, and course work
**The program now encompasses provisions for this.

D. Professional and Civic Activities

1. Within the past twelve months have you engaged in research (not evaluation studies) in the field of education?

34	No	60%	22	Yes	40%

2. Have you published (written, contributed to, or edited) books, manuals, or monographs since September, 1977?

39	No	70%	17	Yes	30%

3. How many articles on education have you published in academic or professional journals since September, 1977?

38	None	67.9%	0	4-6	0
10	1	17.9%	2	7	3.6%
6	2-3	10.7%			

4. Have you published books or articles directly arising from your dissertation study? (R=55)

38	No	69%	3	2 or more articles	5.5%
13	1 article	23.6%	2	1 book	3.6%

5. Have you received (related to education) an honor, award, or recognition since September, 1977? (R=55)

43	No	78.1%	12	Yes	21.8%

(These entries included diverse items such as research awards, listings in directories of distinguished persons, and scholarship awards.)

6. Honorary/professional education organizations in which you now hold membership:

33 Phi Delta Kappa
13 Louisiana Association of Educators
10 Phi Kappa Phi
8 Delta Kappa Gamma
7 National Education Association
6 Kappa Delta Pi
5 Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
4 Louisiana Education Research Association
4 National Council of Teachers of English
3 None
79 Various other organizations mentioned only once.

7. County/Parish, State, Regional, Federal/National positions or offices (other than your current major occupation) related to education you now hold. (NR=34)

County/Parish (Local):
VP, Phi Delta Kappa; Chairperson, Mid-Cities Teacher Center; Reporter, Delta Kappa Gamma; Pres., Special Interest Council; Literary Council; Chairperson, Parish LAE; Parish Library Board of Control

State:
Director, Louisiana Journalism Education Association; Louisiana Reading Association; Consortium Representative for HEW or Child Development; Dir., SW Region, Mid-Louisiana Health Systems; Project Dir., JMSSD Teacher Center Project; Board, Louisiana Principal's Association; Regional (LA.) SACS Commission member; Chairperson, Louisiana 2nd District, SACS; Member (and Editor of Newsletter) La. Elem. Comm. SACS.

Regional: None

Federal/National: None

8. Committee services performed related to education since doctorate:

19 Higher Education
16 Professional Organizations
6 Parish Schools or School System
3 Numerous
14 None

Part II

Employers' Opinionnaire

A twenty-three item Opinionnaire was mailed to the employers of the forty-five graduates who had granted permission to survey their employers. The Opinionnaire items requested an evaluation of the graduate based on the following scale:

5 - Definitely agree	3 - Uncertain	1 - Definitely disagree
4 - Partially agree	2 - Partially disagree	0 - Not applicable

The questions on the Opinionnaire and the averages of the ratings are recorded below. These data represent the responses on the 43 (95.5%) Opinionnares returned. The mean on Items 1 through 19 was 4.5, as compared with a mean of 4.3 on a different 25-item instrument for the 1960-74 study. (Only 6 items were common to both studies.)

1. Communicates effectively with the public.

25 Definitely agree	1 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
15 Partially agree	0 Partially disagree	2 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.6

2. Has a clear-cut concept of the role of an educator.

30 Definitely agree	3 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
8 Partially agree	1 Partially disagree	1 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.6

3. Gives indications of having a carefully worked-out philosophy of education.

26 Definitely agree	2 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
13 Partially agree	0 Partially disagree	2 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.5

4. Has good basic understanding of the foundations of education (history, philosophy, measurements.)

26 Definitely agree	2 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
12 Partially agree	0 Partially disagree	3 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.6

5. Contributes creative or innovative ideas related to professional position.

23 Definitely agree	5 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
14 Partially agree	1 Partially disagree	0 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.4

6. Displays ability to relate to and work with all ethnic groups.

28 Definitely agree	2 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
10 Partially agree	1 Partially disagree	2 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.6

7. Exhibits operational knowledge and expertise on the applications of educational theory and research when fulfilling the responsibilities of position.

25 Definitely agree	2 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
16 Partially agree	0 Partially disagree	0 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.5

8. Receives systematic evaluation from professional subordinates.

15 Definitely agree	3 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
9 Partially agree	1 Partially disagree	15 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.4

9. Engages actively in professional activities.

27 Definitely agree	2 Uncertain	1 Definitely disagree
11 Partially agree	1 Partially disagree	1 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.5

10. Has developed an understanding of the school as a societal sub-system.

26 Definitely agree	2 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
11 Partially agree	1 Partially disagree	3 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.6

11. Is knowledgeable concerning the laws and regulations pertaining to the functioning of the school.

29 Definitely agree	1 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
9 Partially agree	1 Partially disagree	3 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.7

12. Exhibits operational knowledge of instructional techniques and materials.

30 Definitely agree	2 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
9 Partially agree	0 Partially disagree	2 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.7

13. Exhibits ability to initiate and maintain positive human relationships with professional peers, superiors and subordinates.

26 Definitely agree	2 Uncertain	1 Definitely disagree
11 Partially agree	3 Partially disagree	0 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.3

14. Has an understanding of important social and economic factors and forces that affect education of youth.

23 Definitely agree	5 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
12 Partially agree	0 Partially disagree	3 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.5

15. Understands child and adolescent development as related to the psychology of learning.

25 Definitely agree	6 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
10 Partially agree	0 Partially disagree	2 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.5

16. Demonstrates skills in research and evaluation in resolving educational problems.

23 Definitely agree	5 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
10 Partially agree	0 Partially disagree	5 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.5

17. Is knowledgeable of methods and sources of school finance.

13 Definitely agree	9 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
17 Partially agree	0 Partially disagree	4 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.1

18. Has an understanding of curriculum planning and development.

20 Definitely agree	2 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
17 Partially agree	1 Partially disagree	3 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.4

19. Demonstrates knowledge of goals, strategies, and outcomes of contract negotiations and grievances procedures involving school employees and the Parish Board of Education.

9 Definitely agree	7 Uncertain	0 Definitely disagree
6 Partially agree	0 Partially disagree	21 Not applicable

Average rating: 4.1

20. Is currently spending most of his time on duties related to doctoral field of specialization.

33	Yes	82.5%	7	No	17.5%	3	N.A.

21. Please identify the item that you believe is the graduate's strongest or best skill or quality.

Item No.	Item	Percentage
7	Exhibits operational knowledge of instructional techniques, material.	15.9
6	Has clear-cut concept of role of educator.	13.6
5	Exhibits operational knowledge and expertise in application of educational theory and research when fulfilling responsibilities.	11.4
5	Engages actively in professional activities.	11.4
4	Contributes creative or innovative ideas related to professional position.	9.1
3	Communicates effectively with public.	6.8
3	Exhibits ability to initiate and maintain positive human relationships with professional peers, superiors, and subordinates.	6.8
3	Has understanding of important social, economic factors that affect education of youth.	6.8
2	Is knowledgeable concerning laws and regulations pertaining to functioning of school.	4.5
2	Demonstrates skill in research and evaluation in resolving educational problems.	4.5
1	Has good basic understanding of foundations of education.	2.3
1	Displays ability to relate to and work with all ethnic groups.	2.3
1	Understands child and adolescent development as related to psychology of learning.	2.3
1	Has an understanding of curriculum planning and development.	2.3
1	N R	

N = 45 (Two had two responses.)

22. Please indicate the item described which you believe to be the graduate's weakest skill or quality.

No.	Item	Percentage
5	Exhibits operational knowledge of instructional techniques, materials.	14.7
5	Is knowledgeable of methods, sources of school finance.	14.7
3	Has an understanding of curriculum planning and development.	8.8
3	Demonstrates knowledge of goals, strategies, and outcomes of contract negotiations between school district employees and parish Board of Education.	8.8
2	Has a clear-cut concept of role of educator.	5.9
2	Has good basic understanding of foundations of education.	5.9
2	Contributes creative or innovative ideas related to professional education.	5.9
2	Exhibits operational knowledge, expertise in application of theory and research.	5.9
2	Receives systematic evaluation from professional subordinates.	5.9
2	Engages actively in professional activities.	5.9
2	Demonstrates skills in research and evaluation in resolving educational problems.	5.9
1	Has developed understanding of school as societal sub-system.	2.9
1	Is knowledgeable concerning laws and regulations pertaining to function of school.	2.9
1	Has an understanding of important social and economic forces that affect education of youth.	2.9
1	Understands child and adolescent development as related to psychology of learning.	2.9
9	N R	

N=34 responses

23. Comments or evaluations:

Is an excellent staff colleague.
Is a strong "basic teacher" in grades 7 and 8.
Has had difficulty in putting theory into practice but is gradually and slowly but surely improving in this area.

CONCLUSIONS

From the data presented in the follow-up study the following conclusions were drawn.

1. The 1975-78 doctoral graduates of the LSU College of Education pursued their program fewer months than the 1960-70 graduates (3.8 years as compared to 4.2).

2. Although the mean age at graduation was 39.5 for the 1975-78 graduates (as compared to 42.1 previously), the age at completion remains higher than the national average for the doctorate in education (38 plus).

3. Although considerably larger in percent of increase than the national increase, the percentage of the total number of Education doctorates earned by women at LSU has increased from 24.2% during 1960-74 to 54.1% during 1975-78 and reflects the national trend.

4. Current support for doctoral students in residence is probably inadequate. More graduate assistantships at larger stipends are needed.

5. The data indicate some justifiable desire to substitute additional research tools courses (statistics and data processing) for the Ph.D. language requirement.

6. Although the number of doctoral graduates native to Louisiana has dropped from 90% (1960-1974 graduates) to 73%, LSU students still study with few students from out-of-state. The 62 graduates earned bachelor's or master's degrees from 13 other states and two other countries. It is probable, thus, that the graduates have a parochial professional perspective. Choice of LSU by natives because of the related factors of location and economics undoubtedly is involved in this effect.

7. The data suggest a need for continuous review and evaluation of the doctoral program structure, degree requirements, and instructional techniques.

[Although recent differentiation of the Ph.D. and Ed D. programs and reorganization of the College may mitigate this need in terms of future graduates under the new programs.] Professional goals seem to be the dominant factors in deciding to pursue the Ed.D. or the Ph.D. The factors influencing choice of dissertation seem to indicate a need for consideration by the faculty of some means of developing an area or area(s) for which LSU is known. Also, more post-dissertation publication should be encouraged.

8. The high level of interaction between faculty and students within a harmonious relationship reported in the previous doctoral follow-up study was reported as similarly high in this study--indicating a desirable level of human relations satisfaction is held by the graduates.

9. The data indicated a need for a placement service for doctoral graduates. They tend to return to their previous jobs and are employed in only 7 states and one foreign country.

10. As in the previous study, the graduates appeared to possess outstanding personality traits as related to their present employment.

11. Employers in 1978 appeared to regard the 1975-78 graduates even better in preparation and performance than the employers in 1975 regarded the 1960-78 graduates (4.5 as compared to 4.3).

12. The data collected from the graduates suggested that the doctoral programs do not reflect adequate specialization for their present positions (e.g., 59% employed in colleges or universities in 1975 as compared to 43% in 1978, and 32.9% in public school systems as compared to 35.7% in 1978).

13. By the diminution of certain data one can conclude that the finding in the former study of problems in communication and cooperation between

departments and/or Colleges within LSU, particularly between major and minor areas, is now less applicable.

14. The mean and median incomes of the 1975-78 graduates were $18,125 and $15,214, as compared with the 1960-74 graduates ($18,602 and $17,550), and indicates that recent graduates are starting at higher salaries (48.2% between $15,000-$19,999 as compared to 35% in 1960-74 at that level). The higher mean and median for the 1960-74 group probably reflects the longer span of service they had had after graduation.

15. Generally, the 1975-1978 LSU doctoral graduates in Education are satisfied (with the exception of their concern over the loss of NCATE-accreditation) with the substance and quality of their programs. (See Part I, C., 7. through 9.) Also, their employers regard them as well-prepared, personally adjusted, and performing well.

APPENDIX 1

62 Doctoral Graduates of LSU, 1975-May, 1978

YEAR, DEGREE AND SEX

PH.D.				ED.D.		
Male	Female	Total	Year	Male	Female	Total
2	4	6	1975	4	2	6
2	9	11	1976	4	3	7
5	10	15	1977	8	2	10
1	2	3	1978	2	2	4
10	25	35	TOTALS*	18	9	27
28.6% of 35	71.4% of 35	56.5% of 62		66.7% of 27	33.3% of 27	43.6% of 62

* 28 Male (45.9%), 34 Female (54.1%)

These figures may be compared with the USDHEW Analysis of Doctor's Degrees Awarded to Men and to Women, 1970-71 Through 1974-75: The percentage of females receiving doctorates (all disciplines) increased from 14.3% of the total in 1970-71 to 21.3% in 1974-75. In Education the increase was from 21.2% to 30.8%. In 1975-76 Education led all disciplines with 23% of all doctorates awarded, with social sciences second with 12%.

APPENDIX 2

238 Doctoral Graduates of LSU, 1936-May, 1978

YEAR, DEGREE AND SEX

Ph. D.				Ed. D.	
Male	Female	Year	Total		
1	0	1936	1		
3	0	1937	3		
2	0	1938	2		
1	0	1939	1		
2	0	1940	2		
0	1	1941	1		
0	0	1942	0		
0	0	1943	0		
1	1	1944	2		
0	0	1945	0		
0	0	1946	0		
2	0	1947	2		
2	0	1948	2		
2	0	1949	2		
2	0	1950	2		
1	0	1951	1		
4	0	1952	4		
3	0	1953	3		
5	2	1954	7		
1	0	1955	1		
3	1	1956	4		
6	1	1957	7		
5	1	1958	6	Male	Female
1	2	1959	3		
2	0	1960	3	1	0
3	1	1961	5	0	1
1	0	1962	3	2	0
2	1	1963	6	3	0
0	2	1964	5	2	1
1	1	1965	7	5	0
1	2	1966	5	2	0
1	0	1967	4	3	0
3	1	1968	8	3	1
3	0	1969	7	4	0
2	2	1970	12	8	0
6	1	1971	15	7	1
4	0	1972	10	6	0
1	4	1973	13	8	0
7	4	1974	17	4	2
2	4	1975	12	4	2
2	9	1976	18	4	3
5	10	1977	25	8	2
1	2	1978	7	2	2
94	53	TOTALS*	238	76	15

*TOTALS--238: 170 Males (71.4%), 68 females (28.6%)
147 Ph.D.s (61.8%), 91 Ed.D.s (38.2%)
(1960-78--184: 125 males (67.9%), 59 females (32.1%)
93 Ph.D.s (50.6%), 91 Ed.D.s (49.4%)